

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MARIA J. AYALA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

SEPHORA; JENNIFER RIVERA,

Defendant.

19-CV-10214 (JGK)

ORDER OF SERVICE

JOHN G. KOELTL, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff brings this *pro se* action under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112-12117, alleging that her employer discriminated against her based on her disability. By order dated November 4, 2019, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, she is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (“The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff’s responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*,

378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants Sephora and Jennifer Rivera through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return forms (USM-285 forms) for these defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon these defendants. Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if her address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Sephora and Jennifer Rivera and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

New York, New York

11/8/19



JOHN G. KOELTL
United States District Judge

DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES

1. Sephora
2013 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10023
2. Jennifer Rivera
2103 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10023